

Mines has made debt repayments totaling more than \$40 million.

A General Accounting Office study in 1992 recommended that the helium debt be canceled since it was characterized as a bookkeeping transaction between two Federal agencies, with no impact on the deficit or national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my comments will give my colleagues a better understanding of Federal involvement in helium. The national media and others have both maligned and misunderstood this program. I have urged my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 3008 so that true reform of the helium program may become a reality. Sadly, H.R. 3008 will actually prevent speedy privatization of the helium operations and prohibit the sale of excess helium.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong support of H.R. 3008, the Helium Privatization Act of 1996. This legislation represents a small but important step toward a more commonsense approach toward developing the proper role of the Federal Government.

The Federal Helium Program is clearly an anachronism which deserves elimination. While it may have served a purpose during the first part of this century, the justification for the Federal Helium Program has certainly run out of gas.

This Member has long recognized the need to eliminate this wasteful and nonessential governmental program. In 1993, this Member wrote to the President suggesting spending cuts which would help reduce the Federal deficit. This list included a proposal to sell the national helium reserves as a way to save taxpayer dollars. This Member also cosponsored helium privatization legislation introduced by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. COX] in this Congress as well as the previous Congress.

The healthy private helium industry offers strong evidence that the Federal Government should get out of the business. The private sector currently provides more than 90 percent of the Nation's helium needs. In fact, as a result of the efficiency of the private helium industry, the United States now produces eight times more helium than the rest of the countries combined. It is unnecessary and improper for the Federal Government to retain its current monopoly on the sale of helium to Federal agencies.

H.R. 3008 offers an effective approach toward the privatization of the Federal Helium Program. This legislation will save taxpayers money by ending the production, refining, and marketing at the Federal helium facility in Texas. It will also require the sale of the Federal Helium Program's production facilities and other equipment and privatize the current helium stockpile. The proceeds from these asset sales will then be applied toward the program's massive debt to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to vote for H.R. 3008, the Helium Privatization Act of 1996. It's commonsense legislation which will benefit private business and the American taxpayers.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, the recently passed omnibus appropriations bill was a historic achievement. With it, Congress significantly reduced the Washington bureaucracy. Nearly 200 outdated Federal programs were eliminated.

This was a good first step toward a balanced budget. Now, we must maintain this momentum by taking more steps. For instance, we must get the Government out of the money-draining helium production business. This will save taxpayers nearly \$9 million annually—money badly needed in far more vital areas of our economy. I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 3008.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I know of no other Federal program more maligned and misunderstood than the Department of Interior, Bureau of Mines, helium operations. Many of my colleagues have piled on board to eliminate the program. They've heard the clever talking points about German zeppelins and toy balloons. Although I know I am in the minority on this issue, I hope to set the record straight on a few essential points.

The Federal helium operation is actually one of the few Federal programs that has done what it was intended to do. Going from a time when there was no helium produced by the private sector, the Helium Act has been tremendously successful in helping to develop private sector production and a strategic reserve for helium.

I hope my colleagues and the folks out there listening to this debate will reflect on 67 years of dedicated, quality service given this country by those who took on a mission in 1929. My colleagues who mention the cost to taxpayers for this program are speaking of the accumulated interest costs—not the annual cost, which is a net positive gain to the U.S. Treasury of \$10 million last year alone.

A legitimate debate has taken place regarding whether or not the Federal Government should be in the helium business. Regardless of your view, this bill, H.R. 3008, is not the best answer. Here's why: This measure effectively prevents private purchase of the helium reserves and refinery. It attempts to recoup the Government's investment with a formula selling off 100 years worth of helium. But it will do so at a price still higher than what its private competitors sell at market.

The bill is designed—plain and simple—to repay the debt and interest on a loan that was made between two Federal agencies. But also just as plain and simple, this bill will not privatize the helium operations. All of that excess helium will remain unsold.

However, there is a better, more balanced approach: It was offered by another one of our colleagues, MAC THORNBERRY, during the budget debate over this legislation in the Resources Committee. His amendment would have allowed some helium to be sold at market price, as long as it did not disrupt the market. Adequate helium stockpile would remain for national security needs, while ensuring the taxpayer a sufficient return on their investment. It would have canceled the bookkeeping debt between two Federal agencies. This commonsense substitute is nowhere in today's bill. The inclusion of this language into H.R. 3008 would have made this measure a better investment for taxpayers. Without a balanced, commonsense approach, I cannot support H.R. 3008. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" so that true reform of the helium program may become a reality.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLINGER). The question is on the mo-

tion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3008.

The question was taken.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the various bills considered today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess until 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 5 p.m.

□ 1704

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE) at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1996 AND 1997—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Departments of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes.

The question is, will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, during this debate, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the veto message on H.R. 1561.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, despite the President's State of the Union promise to "end the era of big government", on Friday, April 12, President Clinton vetoed H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. This compromise bill delivered on the President's pledge to reduce the size of Government through a flexible reorganization of the international affairs agencies. It was, regrettably, rejected by the administration as unacceptably restrictive.

I am stunned by this assessment. Instead of working with the International Relations Committees to fulfill the mutual goals of reforming our international operations, the administration remained mute and unwilling to find a bipartisan approach.

The administration's attempts to reinvent and reform Government, are merely hollow platitudes, with little creativity, or bipartisan support to sustain them. This is a great disappointment since we should be well on our way to organizing our international relations for the next century. The only thing this administration has reinvented are new excuses to maintain the status quo.

Let me remind my colleagues that in January 1995, Secretary of State Warren Christopher proposed the idea to President Clinton to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies that proliferated during the cold war. He argued that consolidation would reduce duplication, cut the budget, and provide a firm new direction to U.S. foreign policy in this century. Secretary Christopher was right. His idea recognized that to meet a changed world, the institutions themselves need to be changed.

The core missions of the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to contain the spread of communism all dissipated with the fall of the Berlin Wall. Regrettably, the President disagreed with his own Secretary of State and chose to defend the bureaucracies. The Foreign Relations Authorization Act was offered as the blueprint for the future, yet the President vetoed this bill.

Many of our colleagues in the House and the Senate agreed with the need to change the foreign affairs structure to meet the future. That support is well placed and appreciated. This legislation reflects the interests of the American public to reduce spending and zero in on the essential activities of our international affairs agencies. It also applies the MacBride fair employment principles to Northern Ireland, links expansion of our embassy to progress

on POW's/MIA's, backs our allies on Taiwan, helps protect Chinese women fleeing coercive abortion policies, includes the Humanitarian Corridors Act to help Armenia, and fully funds antinarcotic and Peace Corps activities.

I want to make a special note regarding Father Sean McManus. No one has fought harder against discrimination in Northern Ireland. Father Sean single-handedly brought the MacBride fair employment principles to the edge of enactment. I am greatly disturbed to see an apparent White House effort orchestrated to discredit Father Sean and his work, so as to divert attention away from another flip flop of a campaign pledge. I am ashamed of their actions and opposition to the cause of fair employment for all in Northern Ireland.

This was a well considered bill, and reflects many of the interests and concerns of the administration. Over 20 major organizations including Citizens Against Government Waste and the American Legion support provisions in this bill.

Therefore, I urge you to support the veto override motion to end waste, overlap, and duplication in our foreign affairs agencies. Let us seize this opportunity to make constructive changes that will move us effectively into the next century.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 1561 and to vote no on the motion to override which will ensue shortly.

H.R. 1561 is a flawed bill. It would undermine the foreign policy powers of the Presidency and force the adoption of policies that would harm U.S. national interests. It does not give the President the funds he needs to conduct U.S. foreign policy and protect and promote U.S. interests. It mandates a far-reaching reorganization of the U.S. foreign policy apparatus that has no connection to the real problems of foreign policy.

In short, this bill, rather than revitalize U.S. foreign policy, as its sponsors suggest, would weaken the power of the President—any President—to conduct foreign policy. If we allow this bill to become law we would be reducing U.S. influence in the world.

Let me mention several specific provisions.

This bill interferes with the President's authority to organize the foreign affairs agencies. It mandates the elimination of at least one agency—any agency—and severely reduces budget levels at other agencies. Yet the proponents have never demonstrated the need for this reorganization. They have never demonstrated how the conduct of American foreign policy would be improved under this reorganization. They have merely mandated that it occur.

This bill also includes numerous policy provisions that tie the President's hands in the conduct of foreign policy. I will mention just three of the more serious problems in this area.

It amends the Taiwan Relations Act in a way that undermines longstanding United States policy on China, including the 1982 joint communique. The management of relations with China is one of the central challenges of United States foreign policy. The administration right now is working to reduce tensions between China and Taiwan. This provision if enacted would complicate, not facilitate, that task.

It unduly restricts the President's ability to normalize relations with Vietnam, which could set back progress that has been made on the POW-MIA issue.

It limits United States participation in international organizations, including the United Nations. A provision restricting intelligence sharing with the United Nations infringes on the President's power to conduct diplomacy. These provisions would also make it difficult, if not impossible, to pursue efforts to reform the United Nations and reduce the assessed United States share of the U.N. budget.

The funding levels set in this bill are inadequate to conduct U.S. foreign policy and protect U.S. interests. Reduced funding levels of U.S. missions overseas would limit our ability to promote arms control and nonproliferation, reform peacekeeping, streamline public diplomacy and promote sustainable development.

U.S. foreign policy is most effective when it enjoys bipartisan support, and when the President and Congress work together to advance U.S. interests. H.R. 1561 has never enjoyed bipartisan support, and does not appear to be based on the principle of cooperation between the branches. All but nine Democrats opposed this conference report when it was adopted in the House on March 12, by a vote of 226-172. I urge my colleagues who voted against the conference report to vote today to sustain the President's veto.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me the time.

Let me just begin by expressing my very sincere thanks for the great job that Chairman BEN GILMAN did in sheparding this legislation through the Congress, through both Houses, through a very difficult markup in full committee, the divisive floor fight that we had. Regrettably it was divisive, and then a very difficult conference, and now we are trying to deal with an override attempt, and hopefully that will succeed. He did a very good job. He was very fair, and this legislation, I

think, is a very reasonable piece of legislation that merits the support of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, when President Clinton vetoed H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1996 and 1997, he gave a number of reasons. He said that we were spending too little. He said it was somehow inappropriate for Congress to require the executive branch to consolidate Federal agencies even though the legislation mirrored Secretary Christopher's consolidation proposal. As a matter of fact, it was even less, far less than what actually Secretary Christopher wanted us to do. You might call it "Christopher light" in that regard. It would only consolidate and get rid of one agency rather than three.

The President said it was inappropriate to prohibit the expansion of our Embassy in Hanoi until the Hanoi regime comes clean on POW's and MIA's. Mr. Speaker, I think the POW-MIA issue is one of the most important issues this Congress, this country could ever face, and not to link those issues with an ongoing effort to resume full diplomatic relations with Hanoi would be a serious mistake.

Mr. Speaker, he objected to the provision of H.R. 1561 which states that the Taiwan Relations Act supersedes the joint communiques with the People's Republic of China, even though this is a simple and uncontroversial statement of law and fact. A law enacted by Congress and signed by the President does supersede an agreement entered into only by the executive to the extent that there is any conflict between the two.

Then the President provided a laundry list, apparently generated by the State Department bureaucracies, of other provisions that they would prefer not to have been in the bill. By discussing these issues and only these issues, the President's veto message managed to obscure what H.R. 1561 is really all about.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a human rights bill. It is about the United States vigorously pursuing a foreign policy which is internationalist, not isolationist, which is driven by fairness and justice and not by diplomatic convenience. Despite the need to cut spending and consolidate programs, H.R. 1561 as passed by the House and Senate manages to hold harmless or even enhance the most important programs and to enact important policy provisions that will support freedom, building democracy and save lives.

Mr. Speaker, even more important than spending levels are the foreign policy provisions themselves. The bill contains a number of important provisions that would require human rights be at the centerpiece of our U.S. foreign policy. For example, the Humanitarian Aid Corridors Act, section 1617 of the bill, would limit assistance to countries that restrict the transport or delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance. I offered this language to the bill,

and I was also the prime sponsor of the Humanitarian Aid Corridors Act because it is wrong, absolutely wrong for any country receiving American assistance to keep United States humanitarian assistance from reaching another country; yet this is precisely what is being done by Turkey, which has been blockading Armenia for several years. The result? People die, children and mothers and families get sick because our medicines and our foodstuffs never get to Armenia, and those that do get there get there in much lesser amounts.

Then take, for example, the MacBride principles, guaranteeing that U.S. assistance programs in Northern Ireland will only go toward projects that do not engage in religious discrimination, which provide employment opportunities for members of the region's Catholic minority. Here Mr. Clinton has done 180 degrees. He has done a flip-flop.

Members might recall that in April 1992, when asked about the MacBride principles, then-candidate Clinton said: I like the principles; I believe in them. He went on to say how strongly he supports them. And yet in a letter that we received from the White House dated April 11, Anthony Lake writes: The President does not believe it would be useful to place conditions on the funding we provide to the International Fund for Ireland.

He is now against the MacBride principles. An election is coming up, so expect another flip-flop right before the election on this one. The proof is in the deed. The President vetoed the MacBride principles, Mr. Speaker, and now we have a situation where the discrimination goes on unabated.

Mr. Speaker, I have so much to say in so little time. On refugee protection we provided very, very important language in this bill that protects the Vietnamese boat people, people who fought with us side-by-side, who this administration has in the past tried to send back, joining with some in the international community.

Mr. Speaker, we would help those people and we also, as the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman, pointed out, would help those women who today languish in U.S. prisons. Their only crime? They were victims of forced abortion. These women who appeared before my Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights came in in chains, Mr. Speaker. These women were almost 3 years in custody simply because they fled the tyranny of the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation reinstates the Reagan-Bush policy of a well-founded fear of persecution being sufficient if they can prove that they have or are in fear of getting a forced abortion.

Mr. Speaker, we have many, many other important provisions in here dealing with broadcasting, protecting Radio Marti and Radio Free Asia and

making sure that those important freedom broadcasts get up and running.

This is a good bill. I urge Members to vote to override the President's veto on this important human rights legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD, the following information:

REFUGEE PROTECTION

The refugee provisions of H.R. 1561 would prevent United States tax dollars from being spent to return to Viet Nam and Laos thousands of men and women who served side-by-side with American forces.

These provisions would also restore the Reagan-Bush policy of protecting people who can show that they are fleeing forced abortion or forced sterilization, or that they have actually been subjected to such measures—such as the women now being held in Bakersfield, California, most of them victims of forced abortion or forced sterilization, all of them about to be forced back to the People's Republic of China. Mr. Chairman, this urgent humanitarian provision has passed both the House and Senate by wide margins. The Administration recently announced that it supports this provision. And yet, tragically, President Clinton vetoed the bill that would have enacted it.

H.R. 1561 would also require periodic reports to Congress on what Fidel Castro is doing to enforce his end of the Clinton-Castro immigration deal of 1994, and on how people are treated who are returned to Cuba pursuant to the second Clinton-Castro immigration deal of May 1995. And it would fill a gap in the law by prohibiting the use of authorized funds to return people to places in which they are in clear danger of being subjected to torture.

DEMOCRACY BUILDING AND FREEDOM SUPPORT

Despite the need for cuts in international broadcasting and other public diplomacy programs, H.R. 1561 would hold harmless two of our "freedom broadcasting" programs: Radio Free Asia and Radio/TV Marti. The bill would also require that when cuts must be made, they must not fall disproportionately on broadcasts to countries such as Iran and Iraq, whose people do not enjoy freedom of information within their own country. The bill also requires that Radio Free Asia commence its broadcasts into China, Viet Nam, North Korea, Burma, and other countries whose people do not fully enjoy freedom and democracy, within 6 months. And the bill would continue the authority for scholarship and exchange programs for Burmese and Tibetan scholars who have been forced into exile by the dictatorships that currently exercise authority in these countries.

Mr. Speaker, even if the President were right to oppose some provisions of H.R. 1561, these human rights provisions were far more important. Mr. Speaker, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle: Which is more essential to America's role in the world: Preserving the federal bureaucracy in exactly the same structure it happens to have now, or helping to end pervasive discrimination against Catholics in Northern Ireland? Making the embassy in Hanoi the biggest embassy it can possibly be, or ending blockades against U.S. humanitarian aid to Armenia and other countries? The sensibilities of the dictatorship in Beijing, the soldiers of Beijing, or the internationally recognized human rights of torture victims?

The President had a clear choice. He chose to throw the baby out with the bath water.

Today we in Congress—all of us, Republicans and Democrats, who are interested in a vigorous American foreign policy based on American values—have a chance to correct the President's mistake. Let us override this veto by an overwhelming bipartisan margin.

GOVERNOR CLINTON ON MACBRIDE PRINCIPLES AT IRISH FORUM, NEW YORK IN APRIL, 1992

I. QUESTION BY RAY O'HANLON, IRISH ECHO: IN EFFECT: IF ELECTED WOULD HE SUPPORT THE MACBRIDE PRINCIPLES?

Answer: "I like the principles. I believe in them. I would encourage my successor to embrace them. If, Lord forbid, I don't get elected President, I'm going to have a legislative session in 1993 and would look at that. As President I would encourage all the governors to look and embrace them. I think it's a good idea. I like them very much."

Follow-up question by O'Hanlon: In effect: One of the objections to the MacBride Principles is that they may discourage investment, would you assure those in opposition that they have nothing to fear from MacBride.

Answer: "Absolutely. I think that it's a way to encourage investment because it's a way to stabilize the political and economic climate in the work force by being free of discrimination. That argument is made against any principles in a country where there is discrimination. I just don't buy that. I don't think that is a serious problem."

II. PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON MARCH 17TH 1993 AT THE WHITE HOUSE ST. PATRICK'S DAY CEREMONY

Asked by Conor O'Clery of the Irish Times if he still supported the MacBride Principles, Mr. Clinton replied "YES I DO."

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter to which I referred:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, April 11, 1996.

The Reverend SEAN MCMANUS,
President, Irish National Caucus, Inc.,
Washington, DC.

DEAR FATHER MCMANUS: Thank you for your letter about the legislation linking the MacBride Principles of fair employment to funding for the International Fund for Ireland.

As you know, the Administration supports the goals of fair employment which the MacBride Principles embody. The Administration also actively supports efforts to promote trade and investment in Northern Ireland and the border counties as the best way to underpin a lasting peace. The President does not believe it would be useful to place conditions on the funding we provide to the International Fund for Ireland, which has an excellent record of attention to and effectiveness on fair employment issues. U.S. companies, with considerable experience in equal opportunity employment, are among the best employers in Northern Ireland in terms of meeting the goals of fair employment.

The setting of the June 10 date for the beginning of comprehensive negotiations on the future of Northern Ireland marks a watershed in the peace process. In this critical period, the Administration will continue to work with the two governments and the parties to help them achieve a just and lasting settlement in Northern Ireland. I appreciate your support for our efforts.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY LAKE,
Assistant to the President for
National Security Affairs.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, there are some very good human rights provisions here, as my colleague from New Jersey mentioned. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], is a very good chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

This bill, nonetheless, still needs to be defeated. It has gone through a revision. It is better than it was when we first were presented with it, but it still should be vetoed, principally because it infringes on the President's right to conduct foreign policy. It micromanages foreign policy. It forces the consolidation of agencies. It basically tells the President that he has to eliminate agencies to conduct foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, it also authorizes spending levels that would force other organizations in the international diplomacy area to retreat. In other words, we are retreating as internationalists through some of the spending provisions in this bill. Plus, the bill fails to provide necessary flexibility for the administration to manage all of these agencies that this bill is ordering virtually be dismantled.

The bill also hurts in very key areas in the funding levels: Arms control and nonproliferation, international peacekeeping, international organizations, public diplomacy, sustainable development. What this is going to cause is a severe reduction in force of highly skilled personnel at several of our foreign affairs agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the bill messes with our China policy. We do not need right now to get into China policy. Things are very delicate there. We do not need to repudiate what President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger, then National Security Adviser Kissinger, preceded with in the Taiwan Relations Act. What we have now is a new venture, a new China policy, which is not in this bill what we should be doing at this moment.

Relations with Vietnam, this is a very, very sticky issue. The last thing we want to do is deter and impede progress on the POW-MIA issue. It is coming. It is coming slowly. I do not think we want to provoke a reaction that is going to stymie any further progress.

On participation in international organizations, Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I think we have some good safeguards right now that deal with intelligence sharing with U.N. agencies. We do not need further micromanagement of this issue.

On housing guaranteed programs: South Africa, Eastern Europe, some very good country programs in these nations. Section 111 would terminate several of these programs, specifically as I said before, in South Africa and Eastern Europe. And family planning, this bill is not a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to, despite the fact that this is not a good bill, ac-

knowledge the very worthwhile efforts by many internationalists on the other side. I think the President has the main ability and right to conduct foreign policy. We are interfering in that.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Indiana has made some very viable and positive statements about what our role as a Congress should be. We do have a role, of oversight, of war powers. But when we get in and micromanage specific situations, I do not think it is in the best interest of this country. The President's veto should be upheld.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], a senior member of our Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in voting to override the President's veto of the conference report to H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1561 makes several reforms to our Nation's foreign policy apparatus: Reducing bureaucracy and cutting waste, while preserving our ability to conduct the foreign affairs of the Nation. That the President would veto a bill which reduces duplication, cuts the budget, provides firm direction to our foreign policy is baffling to me. You cannot say you support balancing the budget and then veto packages which would accomplish just that. You cannot say you support eliminating bureaucracy and then veto a bill which does just that.

However, the president's veto of the bill did more than simply damage our efforts to cut bureaucracy. His veto also directly affects the lives of Chinese detainees held for over 1,000 days in the York County jail in my district, the very city where the Articles of Confederation were written and signed, the very city which was the first capital of the United States. What is their crime? Many of these men fled China in fear of China's coercive abortion and sterilization policy.

It was mentioned that we cannot interfere with our Chinese policy. What is our Chinese policy? I have tried to speak to the President of the United States on this issue for several months, and I only get to speak to the National Security Adviser. When I spoke with him, I said: I suppose this business has something to do with our Chinese policy. He said: Oh, no, it has nothing to do with our Chinese policy or he would know about it, and he did not know about it.

Had these individuals fled China for the United States when the last two Presidents were in office, they would likely have been granted asylum in the United States. Under President Reagan, then Bush, fear of repressive coercive population control policy, which China clearly employs, was

grounds for asylum. Under the Reagan-Bush policy, these individuals would likely have been set free, and the Federal Government would not be paying over \$1 million in taxpayers' money each year to keep them locked up.

Unfortunately, President Clinton changed the policy when he took office in the belief that fear of forced abortion or sterilization does not merit asylum in this country. H.R. 1561 would change the U.S. law back to the Reagan-Bush policy, which was the law of the land for many years and which hardly resulted in our Nation being overrun by hordes of asylum seekers.

Mr. Speaker, I am the first to say that illegal immigrants who have no grounds for asylum must be sent away. But it is wrong to make an example of these Chinese men and women who fear coercive population policy. This provision is supported by the Family Research Council, the National Right to Life Committee, various churches and pro-life groups. This provision is humane and, most of all, it speaks well of America and Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman GILMAN for his work on this bill, and I urge all Members to override the veto, return fiscal sanity and justice to American foreign policy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, [Mr. BERMAN], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in urging my colleagues to vote to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 1561. This is the third vote we have had on this bill. Last June, 192 Democrats voted against H.R. 1561. More recently in March, only nine Democrats supported the conference report. Only six Republicans voted against the conference report.

□ 1730

There is no bipartisan support for this bill.

As I said at the time the conference report was adopted, this was the first time in 13 years that I had the honor of serving in this body that a State Department authorization bill has been taken up in committee, on the floor, or out of a conference committee without bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield. Let me just finish my statement, and then, if I have time, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Why is this bill for the first time breaking with the tradition that this House and this Congress has had to pass this legislation on a bipartisan basis? It is because this bill is not about a bipartisan foreign policy. It is not about protecting America's national interests while rationally reforming Government. This is about tying another scalp to the Republicans' Contract With America belt. It is about nailing another agency so that the Re-

publicans could pretend to claim to have reduced the size of the Federal Government without regard as to whether or not their plan made sense and protected our national interests, just like the cockamamie idea to abolish the Commerce Department when it took every single purpose of that Department and put it in some other part of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, their plan would have eliminated the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency at a time in which clearly one of the most serious threats we face are weapons of mass destruction: nuclear, biological, and chemical. It is about usurping the rights of a Democratic Commander in Chief, trying to paint the President into a corner so he would appear ineffective. Well, President Clinton stood strong, said "No." As he stated in his veto message, the inflexible, detailed mandates and artificial deadlines included in this bill should not be imposed on any President.

I urge my colleagues to support the President, to sustain his veto, and, if I have any additional times, I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. Just let me say that, as my colleague knows, he must find some things in this bill that he agrees with. I mean we worked together on the refugee provisions. There are a lot of things in this bill: the boat people, protections that are in the bill.

But let me just say, so the record is very, very clear about this, during markup of this legislation we had five hearings that preceded the markup in my subcommittee because major provisions of this bill went through my subcommittee because we are the committee of jurisdiction on the State Department. I was much aghast and chagrined by the fact that my ranking member walked out. Rather than participate in the markup, he walked out.

So we talk about bipartisanship. We sought at every turn to include rather than to exclude.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond simply by pointing out two things.

One, I think in retrospect that that was a mistake. Second, the gentleman knows full well, because he has told me on many occasions, he does not agree with the decision to abolish these agencies. He thinks the U.S. Information Agency has a purpose independent from the State Department in communicating a message to the captive countries of this world that agency from the government to government relationships of that State Department. He knows there is no underlying sense in the abolition of these agencies; that is why we are supporting the President's veto. That is why it is the right thing.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Cali-

fornia pointed out, I had misgivings about the consolidation taken as it was originally passed by the House, but we worked with that. There was a spirit of compromise, a spirit of giving and taking, and we got from a consolidation of three agencies down to one, leaving the option to the President of the United States to decide which agency would go. It is my feeling that USIA would not go. It is made up of many more people than ACDA and ACDA was the most likely, which is a relic of the cold war period. I did not know that for sure, but now I have come to that conclusion after much study and research.

So it could be done. We have got to save money.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT], another distinguished member of our Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the effort to override President Clinton's ill-advised veto of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. It is time to end the foreign aid ripoffs, and this legislation is a good start.

I want to take a moment to applaud the hard work and tremendous leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. Chairman GILMAN and the Committee on International Relations' staff have spent countless hours putting together a truly historic piece of foreign policy legislation, only to have it vetoed by a President who prefers the status quo. From the time our committee began deliberations last year, the Clinton administration stood in the way. In fact, top White House lobbyists promised to and I quote, "delay, obfuscate and derail any effort to consolidate outmoded foreign policy bureaucracies and reduce the amount of taxpayer dollars used for foreign aid." They tried but had failed. Congress passed the bill, but the liberal foreign policy establishment had the last word. The President vetoed the legislation saying that our money levels, quote, "fall unacceptably below the level of foreign aid" he wants.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at just what the President vetoed: a bill that would drastically reduce waste in our foreign affairs bureaucracies, that would fully fund our international war on drugs, that would assist Chinese women fleeing coercive abortion policies, that would finally apply McBride fair employment practices to Northern Ireland, and that would support our longtime friends and allies in Taiwan.

Why did President Clinton veto this bill? Too many reforms, too little bureaucracy, too few tax dollars going to foreign aid. So much for the President who recently told us that the era of big government is over.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1561 is a good bill. It would strengthen America's role in

foreign affairs, and it would provide much needed relief to the American taxpayer.

Let us say no to the status quo, no to the ripoffs. Override the Clinton veto.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Houston, TX [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank my colleague from Florida, and I guess I risk to vigorously disagree with my well-intended colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

I come from a community richly diverse, with many international citizens and international concerns. This is a bad bill, and I would rather have a better bill. I realize the intensity of the work that went into H.R. 1561, and I applaud those who have worked on it. But I think we can go a step further and make this bill more responsive to the responsibilities of the President of the United States.

This bill would impede the President's authority to organize and administer foreign affairs agencies to best serve the Nation's interests. The Agency for International Development, United States Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency are doing valuable work that would be undermined if various programs are consolidated under the State Department.

Yes, we can save money. We all agree that a balanced budget is important. But the cuts in this particular legislation undermine the President's effort and this country to be a world leader.

This bill does not speak well of America's leadership in the world. As a superpower, we must lead by example. We must promote democracy and human rights. We must not isolate ourselves from the rest of the world.

I would ask my colleagues to consider sustaining the President's veto. For example, this bill limits U.S. population assistance. Here we go again, with personal interests and attitudes about the United States' very forceful and productive efforts in working with the world population.

This bill does not allow very important agencies, like the U.S. Information Agency, to carry on its responsibilities, and likewise, I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, this bill simply ties the chief executive officer's responsibility on the world forum.

Yes, it is important to find a balance between the interests of Taiwan and China. Well, we must find it in a way that fairly treats all entities in this and respect previous obligations that this country has made and the Congress has approved. Yes, we must deal with countries like Indonesia and Burma and Turkey and Ireland, but we must likewise see fit to insure that we bring forth a balanced State Department funding and State Department legislative bill.

I would ask simply that this veto be sustained in order for us to get the bet-

ter bill, the better bill that would insure the reimplementation of agencies such as the Agency for International Development, the United States Information Agency, and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as well as insuring that the opportunity to deal with U.S. population and opportunities and service around the world are continued.

Please respond and recognize we must work with the President, not against the President, to insure the right kind of policy internationally.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO], another member of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, in his State of the Union Address, President Clinton boldly declared that the era of big Government was over. Sadly enough, our vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, proves the hollowness of his claim.

H.R. 1561 is the first bill in 40 years to reduce and reform this country's international affairs bureaucracies. A multitude of international agencies and programs proliferated during the cold war in an effort to contain and roll back global communism. With this mission successfully completed, it is time to redesign our foreign policy apparatus. H.R. 1561 consolidates the Agency for International Development, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the U.S. Information Agency into the State Department and reduces their budgets to force streamlining efforts. This bill will save the taxpayers \$1.7 billion over 4 years.

In January 1995, Secretary of State Warren Christopher proposed to President Clinton that he consolidate the many foreign affairs agencies that had sprung up during the cold war. Mr. Christopher wisely argued that the Agencies' independence did not facilitate cohesive policymaking. Republicans took the Secretary at his word and devised such a streamlining bill. Unfortunately, President Clinton ignored the advice of his own Secretary of State when he vetoed H.R. 1561.

Mr. Speaker, this bill reduces bureaucratic duplication, it cuts the budget, and provides a bold new direction to U.S. foreign policy for the coming century. I ask my colleagues to help end the era of big Government and support the motion to override President Clinton's veto.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this provision, as vetoed by President Clinton, is styled the American Overseas Interest Act. I find it passing strange that in all of our discussions, not just here today, but in the runup to this particular measure being on the House floor and the subsequent veto by the President, very little is being said about American interests abroad in a fashion that allows for the private sector to be considered by

those actions that are undertaken by us as policymakers.

It is a fact that American business interests benefit greatly from the efforts that are put forth on behalf of our great country. Toward that end I cannot believe that we would want to mandate such a far-reaching reorganization of the U.S. foreign policy apparatus that has no connection to the real problems of foreign policy.

□ 1645

In my view, having sat in many hearings with my colleagues, it is reorganization for the sake of reorganization. In the final analysis, it just simply will not serve the best interests of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the veto override of H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interest Act.

One of the most important provisions in this bill is the inclusion of the MacBride Fair Employment Principles, consisting of nine fair employment, antidiscriminatory principles that are a corporate code of conduct for United States companies doing business in Northern Ireland. The MacBride Principles were initiated in November 1984 and since their inception have provided Irish-Americans with a direct, meaningful, and nonviolent means of addressing injustice in Northern Ireland. The principles do not call for quotas, reverse discrimination, divestment—the withdrawal of United States companies from Northern Ireland—or disinvestment—the withdrawal of funds now invested in firms with operations in Northern Ireland.

It is my hope that someday employment practices in Northern Ireland will be fair so that this kind of legislation will no longer be necessary. However, at this stage in the Northern Ireland peace process the voice of the United States on the topic of fair employment practices is more critical than ever. I am proud to endorse this bill and urge its passage.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], a senior member of our Committee on International Relations and the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the chairman of the full committee, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the President has been very badly advised in vetoing this bill. It is clear that the foreign aid establishment has closed ranks in opposition to any meaningful reforms. The bureaucracy has worked overtime to maneuver the President into opposing any

changes in our Government's bloated and outdated foreign policy machinery.

Consider just two provisions of our bill which the bureaucracy has fought tooth and nail: First, our bill curtails the foreign aid pipeline. How many Members in this House know that AID has \$8 billion socked away? That is right, \$8 billion left over from previous years. This is on top of the \$6 billion that Congress appropriated to AID this year. Five years ago, AID alerted us to this problem. For 5 years, we have fought to put some limits on this program.

The bill before us would reduce this foreign aid waste by \$1 billion. It would help make permanent reforms to stop the waste that results from overfunding foreign aid programs. But the opponents of this bill say no to any cuts in the foreign aid pipeline.

Second, the bill shuts down one of the worst-run programs in the Government, the housing guarantee program. How many Members know that for 35 years, the American taxpayer has co-signed loans all over the world for housing and community development? Today, the American taxpayer is in hock for nearly \$3 billion in these guaranteed loans in 44 countries.

My subcommittee has conducted a 2-year investigation of this program. Do Members know what we uncovered? We uncovered huge losses in this program. Half, half of the countries which have U.S.-backed loans have stopped payment. That is right; 22 out of the 44 countries. GAO estimates that we are going to have to pay over \$1 billion in bad loans. Our bill would shut down this program and stop the losses by imposing tough penalties on these dead-beat foreign governments. But the foreign aid bureaucracy wants to keep this program going even though it is hemorrhaging money.

There are two other examples, but these two examples, I think, pinpoint the problem with this program. These examples are of vital importance if we are to make the reforms that our taxpayers demand be made. But the foreign aid establishment says no to any reform. For the bureaucrats that populate the State Department, AID, and USIA and the arms control agency, the watchword is business as usual. We cannot have business as usual. That is why we want to override the President's veto, because what we are doing is making some very basic reforms that have to be made.

Today, this House has the opportunity to strike a blow for reform and to stop the abuse and put the interests of the American taxpayer first for a change. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for reform by voting to override the President's ill-considered veto.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this body to sustain the President's veto of this neoisolationist foreign aid bill called the American Overseas Interests Act. We all know this bill proposes deep cuts in our foreign assistance budget and wants to dismantle either the Agency for International Development, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, or the U.S. Information Agency. But what we do not adequately appreciate is the important and distinct responsibilities that all these agencies perform on a day-to-day basis. Those functions and responsibilities will not be performed in the same independent nor effective manner as they are now performed if they are combined within the administrative structure of the State Department. Some of their mission and independence will be compromised.

It is wrong for us to restrict this or any other President's ability to address the complex international challenges and opportunities of the post-cold-war era. At issue is whether the United States will have the policies and the resources available to open markets, to prevent conflicts, to advance our national interests through people-to-people contacts by broadcasting the truth as an antidote to the poison of extremist propaganda, and to prevent crisis through humanitarian aid.

The United States must continue to lead this world. We should not turn our back on a half-century of success. Our past strong investment and a vigorous foreign policy continues to pay enormous dividends: The end of the Soviet Union, a world map dominated with democracies and allies, expanding markets, especially in the Third World, and free elections in South Africa, just to mention a few.

This bill undermines our leadership role in the world. To cut development aid will ultimately cost the United States more in the form of foregone markets, increasing demands for disaster relief, worsening environmental conditions and rising migration pressures.

Foreign aid is an important, cost-effective investment in the future. About 1 percent of the Federal budget is actually spent on foreign aid. Yet, Members have heard time and time again that most of our constituents think that it is about 15 percent of our budget that we spend, and believe it should be around 5 percent.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind the gentleman from Virginia that the foreign aid portion of this legislation was dropped in conference. This is consolidation and State Department reauthorization part C, which was in the original bill, and the gentleman is correct

in noting that that was dropped, so the bill that the President vetoed had nothing whatsoever to do with the foreign aid portion of the legislation.

Mr. MORAN. I appreciate that clarification, Mr. Speaker. But the point that I am making, Mr. Speaker, is the support that this country has for foreign aid, more support than it is obvious to us when we listen to the debate.

The fact is that most Americans think we should be spending five times what we are spending for foreign aid. The fact is that AID is a principal funnel for that foreign aid. I do think that their mission would be compromised if in fact they are consolidated within the State Department.

We ought not wait for a disaster to act, because then the costs are going to be much higher. We ought not revert to the isolationist attitude of the 1930's. What happens in one part of the world can happen in our part of the world. We should not forsake our leadership role in this world. We should be eager to lead this world to promote our interests.

The United States is the world's leader. We have earned that position, not just because we have the strongest military, but because our diplomacy is so effective. Our political and cultural values are widely shared, and our economic system is emulated around the world. The reason is because in the past we have had bipartisan support in Congress and in the administration for a sound appropriation for the managing of our foreign affairs. But with leadership comes responsibilities. I do not think this bill meets them.

We just heard from the AID administrator, Brian Atwood, in the Committee on International Relations. He has cut over 17 percent of his personnel at AID, from 11,000 to 8,700 since President Clinton was elected. That is the second largest cut in the Federal Government. I do not think that cut would have happened if it was part of the State Department.

The administration has already implemented significant steps to reinvent our international operations and reduce costs to the taxpayers. We have asked the government to cut waste, to reduce programs, and to freeze future planning. This administration has responded vigorously with a scalpel, cutting away the fat and the dead tissue.

The problem with this bill is that it hacks away at the muscle and vital organs with a cleaver. It is all posturing and politics to be able to say we eliminated an agency, whatever that agency might be. We are given three choices, but we have to eliminate one of them. It is an artificial savings. It harms not only the body politic, but more importantly, the head of this world in terms of foreign policy, in terms of advancing democracy, advancing truth throughout the world.

We ought not do this. This is a step backward. We have need to be moving forward into a global economy and advancing our democratic interests, creating more purchasing capabilities in

Third World countries that in turn result in market opportunities for our firms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to sustain this veto.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBAC], a member of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBAC] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

(Mr. BROWNBAC asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues and urge them to support this veto override. We need to do this. We need to do this consolidation. If it has not been already pointed out, or even if it has, I would like to reiterate that this is being supported by Secretary Baker, and previously it had the support of Secretary Christopher, until he was talked out of it by some other people within the administration.

I think it is key to point out that lead individuals within the administration, people that have occupied key positions within the foreign policy apparatus, have said that we need to have this sort of consolidation take place. These old entities do not have a place at this point in time of U.S. history. It is important for us to be able to effectively manage our foreign affairs resources at a time of declining budgets, at a time of declining budgets, when we are going to better manage our foreign affairs budgets and resources, that they be put in together, that they be allowed to be managed and consolidated.

The very essence and focus of this bill was to allow some people that are running the foreign policy apparatus to be able to more effectively and efficiently operate the foreign policy apparatus, rather than from these myriad different stand-alone entities. Let us allow some ability to be able to manage this. Any time we are going into a time like we are of balancing the budget for the first time since 1969, we are going to be making changes, needed changes, real changes to take place. What we are going to have to do is allow some flexibility of people in the system to make those changes.

This bill does that. Secretary Christopher was supportive of this bill, and then was talked out of it by other people within the administration, saying, "Well, you should not do this." A prior Secretary of State, Secretary Baker, who I would say knows a little bit of something about foreign affairs and foreign policy, says, "This is a good thing to do. You need to be able to do this to be able to manage foreign affairs." We do not need 5 different entities doing foreign affairs in the United

States. We need one Secretary of State. We need to be able to act, to be able to move, and to be able to get things done.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is more posturing and politics to leave it alone and to not do the veto override; that it is more posturing and politics to say, well, OK, they are just trying to do this to show that they can eliminate an agency, rather than listening to their own people within the system who have said that these are things that needed to be done; than to listen to the people who historically have worked in this area and are saying we need this to effectively manage in a time of downsizing.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the veto override. It is needed. It is needed to effectively manage the foreign affairs arena in our country. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the veto override.

□ 1800

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNBAC. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Let me ask my colleague, for whom I have great respect, and I certainly have great respect for former Secretary Baker that he mentioned, did he say how this reorganization should take place? And specifically which agency should be eliminated? And could the gentleman tell me how all of that, put in context, is going to help improve foreign policy?

Mr. BROWNBAC. I would be happy to. He testified in front of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which my colleague is a distinguished member, as well, saying that this was an entity, that one of these or several of these entities needed to be folded within the State Department itself. What we are saying in this bill is, let us let the State Department itself pick and choose which would be the most effective now, at this point in time, so that they could implement what Secretary Baker and what Secretary Christopher have suggested earlier, as well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. But if the gentleman will yield further, how does that improve foreign policy? When a mission is closed, a U.S. citizen is seeking assistance in some foreign place, how does that help that U.S. citizen? And we do know that missions are closed.

Mr. BROWNBAC. It helps by virtue of allowing the key foreign policy leader for this country who the President has appointed, the Secretary of State, the added flexibility to be able to say in a time of declining budget, "I have this as a higher priority than this artificially set entity over on the other side that the Congress has put." It gives that individual greater flexibility to be able to address what they deem to be the key and the highest point interest. That is why we urge this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gen-

tleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations and the chairman of the Black Caucus.

(Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton in his State of the Union Address promised "to end the era of big government." Big government is over. I think we've got the wrong idea of exactly what the Government should and should not do.

The other side wants us to believe that the United States should not be responsive to the needs of the poor, the hungry, and the dying. They don't want to share in the cost of peacekeeping missions, sustainable development programs, population assistance, and our national security.

Yes, the cold war and imminent nuclear threats of communism and remnants of the past. The core missions of USAID, USIA, and ACDA have changed. Nonetheless, they have been able to adapt to the paradigm shifts of this era.

I am ashamed that I live in a society that devalues human life. While our aid budget is shrinking, our defense budget is steadily increasing. Looks to me like someone forgot to tell the GOP that the Soviet Union is gone.

The GOP claim that this piece of legislation is important because it reflects our American values. Our American values? If this is a reflection of our American values, it is clear just what we value.

We spend less than 1 percent on aid to less developed countries even though the American people said they would be in favor of a 5-percent increase. The G-7 countries especially Japan has become the No. 1 aid donor. They are outranking us in everything.

Where should U.S. foreign policy be targeted for the 21st century? I'll tell you. It should go to Africa and Asia where almost 45 percent of the people live below the U.N. level for absolute poverty.

If this piece of legislation passed, it would undercut U.S. leadership abroad and damage our ability to assure a secure future for all Americans. As an American, I was led to believe that we had a responsibility to help out our allies and friends.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle want to end the Agency for International Development's housing guaranty [HG] program, and restrict the United States from participating in the U.N. Human Rights Committee.

They clearly have different value systems.

The GOP wants to change that. The bill would also restrict funds to normalize relations with Vietnam. The Vietnam war was a horrible war in American history. The hard work we have made with the help of our foreign commercial service has opened markets. They have, more importantly, healed open wounds left from the war.

Yes, my friends, the cold war is over. However, when we talk about cutting agencies like USAID, we are talking about returning to those dark days of foreign policy. Remember—when power and democracy were synonymous, when ballistic missile proliferation were our sleeping partners, our Japan policy was viewed through Soviet lens.

The GOP wants to overturn glasnost and detente.

The bill also limits participation in international organizations such as the United Nations. It also undermines the President's ability to conduct foreign policy.

I have received many letters from my constituents saying the United States should pay up the debts owed to the United Nations. We use the United Nations as a shield and our scapegoat. We used the United Nations in the gulf war.

I cannot with a clear conscience support the veto override. The state of the American Nation and the state of the world are depending on it. At a time in history when our enemies were clear, someone once said, "We can only secure peace by preparing for war."

Even though the Berlin wall has fallen, the GOP wants to take us back to isolationism of the 1930's. Let's let our democracy programs work before our missiles do. Sustain the President's veto of H.R. 1561—Foreign Relations Authorization Act.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the distinguished senior member of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and I thank the gentleman for the characterization as senior member. I appreciate that. I guess I am.

Mr. Speaker, I just hope that the Members will override the President's veto. I know that is difficult to do for some Members, but there are some very important human rights provisions in this legislation, most significantly, the MacBride principles which require fair employment practices by companies with using American funds over in Ireland. If there is any reason in the world why fair employment should not obtain, especially with American funds, I cannot think of it, and the MacBride principles are very important. This bill restores them. As I say, they are very significant.

In addition, this bill remedies a situation where Chinese women have come to this country to escape coerced abortion, coerced sterilization, and they have sought to apply for asylum. Instead, they were brought to our hearing rooms in chains. I think that is a stain on our Nation's conscience. This bill would give them legal status. We consolidate the foreign aid bureaucracy, which is very important.

I think there are a lot of reasons to vote to override and I hope the Members do.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair be good

enough to give me the remaining time on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. The gentleman from New York has the right to close; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, then, I am pleased to yield my remaining time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL], a former member of the Committee on International Relations and the newest member of the Committee on Commerce, and we hope that he will return to the Committee on International Relations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend from Florida, who is my mother's Congressman and is doing such a great job, and I intend to return to the committee.

Let me say first of all, Mr. Speaker, I hope that our House will vote to sustain the President's veto. This is not a good bill and the President was correct in vetoing it. This is an isolationism bill. It is a retrenching bill, a retreating bill.

The United States is the leader of the free world. No one anointed us as leader. We took the mantle. As a result, we have a responsibility. Countries look to us and we have a responsibility for our own self-interest.

There was no Democratic input into this bill. There is a haphazard reorganization of U.S. foreign policy agencies. In fact, it is, Pick an agency, any agency, we want to close an agency, it doesn't matter what agency, just pick one. That is no way to conduct foreign policy. The appropriations are too low. There are not enough funds in here. It undermines the President's ability to conduct foreign policy.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle unfortunately seem to want to embrace isolationism. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the collapse of communism, I feel that the Republican Party is reverting back to its 100 years ago isolationism policies. This is a dangerous policy.

Henry Kissinger, we all know Henry Kissinger, a very prominent Republican Secretary of State, says about this bill, and I quote, "Further cuts would necessitate closing many overseas posts with the result that there would be less complete political and economic reporting on foreign conditions, less effective representation and advocacy of U.S. interests in foreign countries, and less adequate services provided to U.S. citizens traveling abroad, tourists or business people."

So even Henry Kissinger realized that the funding here is dangerously low, and that this is an isolationism

bill and not really a very good bill at all. We should not undermine the President's ability to conduct foreign policy. We are the leaders of the world, my colleagues. Let us act like the leaders of the world. Let us sustain the President's veto. This bill ought not to become law.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the President's State of the Union promise to end the era of big government. President Clinton's own Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, showed that over a year ago when he moved to close three outdated international affairs bureaucracies and fold their functions back into the State Department, giving the President the discretion to pick and choose of those three agencies which he wanted to fold.

This is not an isolationist policy. Responding to Secretary Christopher's plan, this Congress passed a major reform bill to follow through with this plan, reducing waste, duplication, and overlapping among these Federal agencies that are best designed to fight a cold war that ended 5 years ago.

And what was the President's response? His lobbyists responded by promising to, and I quote, "delay, obfuscate and derail" our bill. They failed, and the Congress passed the first sweeping foreign affairs reform bill in over 40 years. The President then used a congressional recess on a Friday afternoon, after the press deadline, to veto the bill which his own Secretary of State first suggested.

With this veto, the President defended the bureaucracy and the status quo in opposition to his own Secretary of State. This is clear proof that under this White House, the era of big government is not over. It lives on, despite the best advice of senior members of his own Cabinet.

We are here today to override the veto of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. In short, this bill gives the President the flexibility to merge one of three foreign affairs agencies back into the State Department as recommended by Secretary Christopher. This bill fulfills the President's campaign promise to back the MacBride fair employment principles in Northern Ireland. This veto means that he has reneged on his promise to our Irish-Americans.

□ 1815

This bill, the product of many hours of negotiations, fulfills many of the administration's objectives, and yet the President vetoed the bill after months of refusing to allow his agencies to work with our House and Senate Committee on International Relations to craft a bipartisan measure.

The hue and cry is that this needs to be a bipartisan bill. This needs to be a bipartisan process. Traditionally this is a bipartisan measure, but, let me point out, bipartisanship requires all parties to participate in this debate.

In this case the administration, the opposition party, offered nothing but roadblocks. In over 50 hours of negotiations on the bill's conference, the House and Senate Democrat staff only attended for purposes of note taking.

I commend the members and staff of our Committee on International Relations for their diligent, tenacious efforts to enact this bill and to fulfill our promise to the American people to reduce the size of the Federal Government.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to override the President's shortsighted veto of H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. Congress has delivered and the President should be held accountable for rejecting a bill that helps to advance our U.S. foreign policy and to end the era of big government.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the adoption of H.R. 1561, the objections of the President notwithstanding.

I have served as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and now the Committee on International Relations since I was first elected a Member of the Congress. In the nearly 16 years that I have served in this body, I have never seen such a partisan, one-sided, ill-considered piece of legislation come out of our committee.

Earlier the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights talked about the process by which this legislation was shovelled through the Subcommittee and Committee. He made reference to me, in my capacity as ranking minority member of the subcommittee, although he did not mention me by name. I was the Democrat who walked out of the subcommittee markup of the sections of H.R. 1561 that were in the jurisdiction of that subcommittee. I was joined in walking out of that markup by every other Democratic member of the subcommittee. Let me explain why my colleagues and I took that action.

Mr. Speaker, the traditional practice when the Democrats were in the majority on the Foreign Affairs Committee was to consult with the minority on all of the issues being considered in the foreign affairs authorization legislation to reach bipartisan compromise on as many issues as possible on the legislation, to reach out and work together to resolve differences. That did not happen. The chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee consulted with some individuals who were not members of the subcommittee or even members of the full International Relations Committee, and he included provisions of interest to them. He did not, however, have the courtesy to consult with me or other members of the minority on the subcommittee on any of these issues.

Not only were we not consulted on the legislation, when we went into the markup of H.R. 1561, we did not have the final version of the bill until the very morning the bill was to be considered. As ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the first version of the bill was delivered to me late on a Wednesday night. Major changes were made in that bill, and a second revised version was delivered to me 2 days later on a Friday evening. The last changes in the bill were made the following

Sunday afternoon. The markup took place the following day—on Monday morning.

I make this point, Mr. Speaker, because I want the record to be clear. There was no bipartisan effort to work out differences or resolve problems in advance. The fact that all of my Democratic colleagues joined me in walking out of the markup only indicates the partisan nature of the process with which we have been dealing on this legislation during the past year.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report was handled in the same partisan fashion. The Republican members of the House International Relations Committee and Republican members of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee met, made their decisions on the legislation, and presented what they had done to the Democratic Members. We were invited to accept what they had done without any opportunity whatsoever to participate in the process of producing a better piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have long advocated bipartisan cooperation on our foreign policy. I am still a strong advocate of such cooperation. We are strongest when we are united. There is no reason we can not and should not work together for the improvement of our country's foreign relations. There are serious threats to our Nation, serious threats in the international arena which affect all Americans. We must work together to meet those challenges. Making partisan political points—which is precisely what H.R. 1561 is about—will do nothing to strengthen our Nation's foreign policy. While there are a few good elements in the legislation, on the whole it will weaken our Nation's ability to face the international challenges we face. We need thoughtful cooperation, and we need careful bipartisan consideration of such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join in voting against the override of the President's veto on this legislation. This is a bad bill. This is a partisan bill. This is a bill that should be defeated.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to again state for the RECORD that I am constantly amazed at the lengths to which the Gingrich Republicans will go to waste the time and money of the American people. Again, we are called to vote to override a Presidential veto on a measure that has been voted for by Members who are subservient to the conservative Republican leadership.

This bill was rejected by the President because it directs a major reorganization of U.S. foreign policy agencies—structured in the most partisan of ways. The President's veto message says: "This legislation contains many unacceptable provisions that would undercut U.S. leadership abroad and damage our ability to assure the future security and prosperity of the American people. It would unacceptably restrict the President's ability to address the complex international challenges and opportunities of the post-cold-war era. It would also restrict Presidential authority needed to conduct foreign affairs and to control state secrets, thereby raising serious constitutional concerns."

I couldn't have said it better.

Mr. Speaker, all across America, schoolchildren studying American history are learning about America's bipartisan foreign policy that allows our Government to function from administration to administration in our dealings

with other countries and world leaders with the knowledge that there will be consistency in our dealings with other governments. World leaders trust American foreign policy because of the strength of our historical ability to forge and carry out a bipartisan foreign policy. This bill strikes all that down.

The Gingrich Republicans have been unable to impose their radical views on America's foreign policy through reasonable debate so they are attempting to force America's foreign policy to their philosophy by imposing reorganization and restrictions on the President. The Gingrich Republicans have been unable to work in harmony with the Clinton administration so they are attempting to force their radical conservative views on America's dealings with foreign policy.

The Gingrich Republicans apparently don't know anything about coalition-building and cooperation with others in Congress to achieve objectives through communication and coordination. These elementary organizational and management strengths are the foundations of America's foreign policy development, and without them being used successfully, America is made to look like a bunch of kids fighting over a ball on the playground.

In closing, the veto message states: "I recognize that the bill contains a number of important authorities for the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency. In its current form, however, the bill is inconsistent with the decades-long tradition of bipartisanship in U.S. foreign policy. It unduly interferes with the constitutional prerogatives of the President and would seriously impair the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs. For all these reasons, I am compelled to return H.R. 1561 without my approval."

And for all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 1561.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 118, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—234

Allard	Boehlert	Chenoweth
Andrews	Boehner	Christensen
Archer	Bonilla	Chrysler
Armey	Bono	Chinger
Bachus	Brownback	Coble
Baker (CA)	Bryant (TN)	Coburn
Baker (LA)	Bunn	Collins (GA)
Ballenger	Bunning	Combest
Barr	Burr	Cooley
Barrett (NE)	Burton	Cox
Bartlett	Buyer	Crane
Barton	Callahan	Crapo
Bass	Calvert	Cremeans
Bateman	Camp	Cubin
Bereuter	Campbell	Cunningham
Bilbray	Canady	Davis
Bilirakis	Castle	Deal
Bliley	Chabot	DeLay
Blute	Chambliss	Diaz-Balart

Dickey Johnson, Sam
 Doolittle Jones
 Dornan Kasich
 Dreier Kelly
 Duncan Kennedy (RI)
 Dunn Kim
 Ehlers King
 Ehrlich Klug
 Emerson Knollenberg
 English Kolbe
 Everett LaHood
 Ewing Largent
 Fawell Latham
 Fields (TX) LaTourette
 Flanagan Laughlin
 Foley Lazio
 Forbes Leach
 Fowler Lewis (CA)
 Fox Lewis (KY)
 Franks (CT) Lightfoot
 Franks (NJ) Linder
 Frelinghuysen Livingston
 Frisa LoBiondo
 Funderburk Longley
 Gallegly Lucas
 Ganske Manton
 Gekas Manzullo
 Gilchrest Martini
 Gillmor McCollum
 Gilman McCrery
 Goodlatte McDade
 Goodling McHugh
 Goss McInnis
 Graham McIntosh
 Greene (UT) McKeon
 Greenwood Metcalf
 Gunderson Meyers
 Gutknecht Mica
 Hancock Miller (FL)
 Hansen Moorhead
 Hastert Myers
 Hastings (WA) Myrick
 Hayworth Nethercutt
 Hefley Neumann
 Heineman Ney
 Herger Norwood
 Hilleary Nussle
 Hobson Oxley
 Hoekstra Packard
 Hoke Parker
 Horn Paxon
 Hostettler Petri
 Houghton Pombo
 Hunter Porter
 Hutchinson Portman
 Hyde Poshard
 Inglis Pryce
 Istook Quillen
 Jacobs Quinn

NAYS—188

Abercrombie Dellums
 Ackerman Deutsch
 Baesler Dicks
 Baldacci Dingell
 Barcia Dixon
 Barrett (WI) Doggett
 Becerra Dooley
 Beilenson Doyle
 Bentsen Durbin
 Berman Edwards
 Beville Engel
 Bishop Ensign
 Bonior Eshoo
 Borski Evans
 Boucher Farr
 Brewster Fattah
 Browder Fazio
 Brown (CA) Fields (LA)
 Brown (FL) Filner
 Brown (OH) Flake
 Cardin Foglietta
 Chapman Frank (MA)
 Clayton Frost
 Clement Furse
 Clyburn Gejdenson
 Coleman Gephardt
 Collins (IL) Geren
 Collins (MI) Gibbons
 Condit Gonzalez
 Conyers Gordon
 Costello Green (TX)
 Coyne Gutierrez
 Cramer Hall (OH)
 Cummings Hall (TX)
 Danner Hamilton
 de la Garza Harman
 DeFazio Hastings (FL)
 DeLauro Hefner

Radanovich
 Ramstad
 Regula
 Riggs
 Roberts
 Rogers
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roth
 Roukema
 Royce
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Saxton
 Scarborough
 Schaefer
 Schiff
 Seastrand
 Sensenbrenner
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Shuster
 Skeen
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Solomon
 Souder
 Spence
 Stearns
 Stockman
 Stump
 Talent
 Tate
 Tauzin
 Taylor (NC)
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Torkildsen
 Upton
 Vucanovich
 Walker
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Watts (OK)
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 White
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Zeliff
 Zimmer

Millender-
 McDonald
 Miller (CA)
 Minge
 Mink
 Moakley
 Mollohan
 Montgomery
 Moran
 Morella
 Murtha
 Nadler
 Neal
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Orton
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pastor
 Payne (NJ)
 Payne (VA)
 Pelosi
 Peterson (FL)
 Peterson (MN)

Bryant (TX)
 Clay
 Ford
 Hayes

Jefferson
 Johnson (SD)
 Kaptur
 Kingston

Lincoln
 Molinari
 Rush

Stupak
 Tanner
 Taylor (MS)
 Tejada
 Thompson
 Thornton
 Thurman
 Torres
 Torricelli
 Towns
 Traficant
 Velazquez
 Vento
 Visclosky
 Volkmer
 Ward
 Waters
 Watt (NC)
 Waxman
 Williams
 Wilson
 Wise
 Woolsey
 Wynn
 Yates

NOT VOTING—11

□ 1836

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2951

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, having discovered a clerical error relative to H.R. 2951, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] be removed as cosponsor of that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF POSTPONED VOTES ON SUSPENSIONS

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 3008, a postponed vote on suspension, precede the vote on H.R. 1823.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed today,

in the order agreed to by the unanimous-consent request of today.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 3008, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 1823, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

HELIUM PRIVATIZATION ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3008.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3008, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 10, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]
 YEAS—411

Ackerman	Clement	Foglietta
Allard	Clyburn	Foley
Andrews	Coble	Forbes
Archer	Coburn	Fowler
Armey	Coleman	Fox
Bachus	Collins (GA)	Frank (MA)
Baesler	Collins (MI)	Franks (CT)
Baker (CA)	Condit	Franks (NJ)
Baker (LA)	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Baldacci	Cooley	Frisa
Ballenger	Costello	Frost
Barcia	Cox	Funderburk
Barr	Coyne	Furse
Barrett (NE)	Cramer	Gallegly
Barrett (WI)	Crane	Ganske
Bartlett	Crapo	Gejdenson
Barton	Creameans	Gekas
Bass	Cubin	Gephardt
Bateman	Cummings	Geren
Beilenson	Cunningham	Gilchrest
Bentsen	Danner	Gillmor
Bereuter	Davis	Gilman
Berman	de la Garza	Gonzalez
Beville	Deal	Goodlatte
Bilbray	DeFazio	Goodling
Billirakis	DeLauro	Gordon
Bishop	DeLay	Goss
Bliley	Dellums	Graham
Blute	Deutsch	Green (TX)
Boehlert	Diaz-Balart	Greene (UT)
Boehner	Dickey	Greenwood
Bonilla	Dicks	Gunderson
Bonior	Dixon	Gutierrez
Bono	Doggett	Gutknecht
Borski	Doolley	Hall (OH)
Boucher	Doolittle	Hall (TX)
Brewster	Dornan	Hamilton
Browder	Doyle	Hancock
Brown (CA)	Dreier	Hansen
Brown (FL)	Duncan	Harman
Brown (OH)	Dunn	Hastert
Brownback	Durbin	Hastings (FL)
Bryant (TN)	Edwards	Hastings (WA)
Bunn	Ehlers	Hayworth
Bunning	Ehrlich	Hefley
Burr	Emerson	Hefner
Burton	Engel	Heineman
Buyer	English	Herger
Callahan	Ensign	Hilleary
Calvert	Eshoo	Hilliard
Camp	Evans	Hinches
Campbell	Everett	Hobson
Canady	Ewing	Hoekstra
Cardin	Farr	Hoke
Castle	Fattah	Holden
Chabot	Fawell	Horn
Chambliss	Fazio	Hostettler
Chapman	Fields (LA)	Houghton
Chenoweth	Fields (TX)	Hoyer
Christensen	Filner	Hunter
Chrysler	Flake	Hutchinson
Clayton	Flanagan	Hyde